IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

VICTORIA GIAMPA,
Petitioner,

v.

THE EIGHTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA, IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF CLARK, AND, THE HONORABLE SANDRA L. POMRENZE, DISTRICT JUDGE, FAMILY COURT DIVISION,
Respondents,
and
CHARLES F. GIAMPA,
Real Party in Interest.

**Filed October 02, 2008**
Tracie K. Lindeman
Clerk of Supreme Court

No. 42424

ORDER DENYING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS OR PROHIBITION

This original proper person petition for a writ of mandamus or prohibition challenges a district court order that denied several motions and declared petitioner a vexatious litigant.

Under NRAP 21(a), a petition for extraordinary relief must contain, among other things, a statement of "the facts necessary to an understanding of the issues presented by the application," the issues presented and the relief sought, and the reasons why the writ should issue.[1] Thus, because

[1] See Pan v. Dist. Ct., 120 Nev. 222, 228-29, 88 P.3d 840, 844 (2004.

petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that extraordinary relief is warranted,[2] she must provide this court with any and all materials that are "essential to an understanding of the matters set forth in the petition."[3] A petition must also be supported by an affidavit of the party beneficially interested[4] and must be served upon the respondent judge and all parties to the district court action.[5]

Here, petitioner failed to include copies of any documents from the district court action, and she did not include an affidavit in support of the petition. She also failed to serve the petition upon the respondent district court judge. Accordingly, we

ORDER the petition DENIED.[6]

_____, J.
Cherry,

_____, J.
Maupin,

_____, J.
Saitta

cc: Hon. Sandra Pomrenze, District Judge,
Family Court Division
Victoria Margaret Giampa
Smith Larsen & Wixom
Eighth District Court Clerk

---

[2] Id. At 228-29, 88 P.3d at 844.
[3] NRAP 21(a).
[4] NRS 34.170; NRS 34.330
[5] NRAP 21(a).
[6] See NRAP 21(b); Smith v. District Court, 107 Nev. 674, 677, 818 P.2d 849, 851 (1991) (stating that whether to grant extraordinary relief is discretionary with this court).